

United States Patent and Trademark Office

len

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,504	05/08/2001	Theodore F. Vaida	01-036	2218
24319 LSI LOGIC CC	7590 03/21/2007 OR POR ATION	- EXAMINER		
1621 BARBER LANE			DUONG, DUC T	
MS: D-106 MILPITAS, CA	A 95035	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2616	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/21/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/851,504	VAIDA ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Duc T. Duong	2616			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period into the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuting reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir bly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed /s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 F	February 20 <u>07</u> .				
-		s action is non-final.				
3)□	<u>_</u>					
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7,9-17 and 19-44 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) 21-42 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7,9-17,19,20,43 and 44 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers		·			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Bureasee the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati prity documents have been receive nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	He)					
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da				

Art Unit: 2616

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-17, 19, 20, 43, and 44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 2. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 21 and 31 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding to claim 21, line 3, the phrase "a programmable" should be replaced with --a **plurality** programmable-- to conform to the claim language.

Regarding to claim 31, lines 3-4, the phrase "a programmable logic core block (MP-block)" should be replaced with --a **plurality** programmable logic core blocks (MP-blocks)-- to conform to the claim language.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-7, 9-17, 19, 20, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Starr et al (US Patent 6,807,581 B1) in view of Pandya et al (US Patent 6,792,502 B1).

Art Unit: 2616

Regarding to claims 1 and 11, Starr discloses a programmable network application specific integrated circuit 700 (fig. 15 col. 20 lines 25-27), comprising a media access controller 722-728 configured to transmit and receive network data (fig. 15 col. 20 lines 61-67 and col. 21 lines 1-7); a programmable logic core 780 (fig. 15 col. 21 lines 43-47) having an arithmetic logic unit 902 (fig. 17C col. 24 lines 6-8) that are dynamically configurable to implement a plurality of application level functions capable of generating meta-data (col. 21 lines 56-59), said programmable logic core 780 configured to interface with said media access controller 722-728 and implement least one said plurality of application level functions (col. 32 lines 18-39).

Starr fails to teach for an array of arithmetic logic units.

However, Pandya discloses a processor 310 comprising a plurality arithmetic logic units ALUs (fig. 8 col. 12 lines 19-24).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to arrange for a plurality of arithmetic logic units ALUs as taught by Pandya in Starr's system to speed up or/and enhance the processor functions.

Regarding to claims 2 and 12, Starr discloses the programmable logic core 780 may be programmed while said least one application level function executing (col. 22 lines 23-26).

Regarding to claims 3, and 13, Starr discloses the programmable network application specific integrated circuit 700 comprising a data interconnect subsystem 756 configured to transmit and receive said network data from said MP-block (fig. 15 col. 21 lines 32-33) and a function master subsystem 740 configured to receive said meta-data

Art Unit: 2616

from said MP-block and dynamically program said programmable logic units 780 (fig. 15 col. 22 lines 1-15).

Regarding to claims 4 and 14, Starr discloses the data interconnect system 756 is further configured to transmit and receive said network data from a host system 20 (fig. 1 col. 5 lines 9-13).

Regarding to claims 5 and 15, Starr discloses the function master subsystem 740 is configured to transmit said meta-data to a host system 20 and capable of receiving programming instructions from said host system 20 (fig. 1 col. 6 lines 15-39).

Regarding to claims 6 and 16, Starr discloses the function master subsystem 350 is capable of programming said programmable logic core 310 based upon said metadata (fig. 1 col. 6 lines 40-57).

Regarding to claim 7 and 17, Starr discloses the function master subsystem 740 is capable of programming said programming logic core based upon said network data (fig. 1 col. 6 lines 58-67).

Regarding to claims 9 and 19, Starr discloses at least one application level function is a validation of packet (col. 6 lines 58-63).

Regarding to claims 10 and 20, Starr discloses the programmable logic core 700 includes a management interface 732-738 configured to control and manage said media access controller 722-728 (fig. 15 col. 21 lines 8-19).

Regarding to claim 43, Starr discloses the arithmetic logic units are register transfer level (RTL) configurable (fig. 17C col. 24 lines 8-10).

Art Unit: 2616

Regarding to claim 44, Starr discloses at least one application level function is a content based addressing (col. 6 lines 58-63).

Page 5

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 21-42 are allowed.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc T. Duong whose telephone number is 571-272-3122. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00 AM-6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy D. Vu can be reached on 571-272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

 $\mathcal{O}\mathcal{D}$

HUY D. VU SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

volla